



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pared with Nietzsche's *Uebermensch*, the Elizabethan superman here depicted presents many similarities, but differs essentially in being compassionate and willing to aid. Theseus is described not merely as noble but as of boundless goodness. While following Zarathustra's advice that one should remain faithful to earth, he does not despise the benediction of those for whom he has fought, "Both heaven and earth friend thee for ever." To repeat, Nietzsche's *Uebermensch* is antichristian. Theseus is Greek and non-Christian. The play proclaims, "I am not against your faith yet I continue mine."

WALTER LIBBY.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

THE RACIAL INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY AND POLITICS.

RACE PREJUDICE. By Jean Finot. Translated by Florence Wade-Evans. London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1906. Pp. xvi, 320.

LA PHILOSOPHIE DE L'IMPERIALISME: I. LE COMTE DE GOBINEAU ET L'ARYANISME HISTORIQUE. Par Ernest Seillière. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie, 1903. Pp. xli, 447.

WHITE CAPITAL AND COLORED LABOR. By Sydney Ollivier, C. M. G. (*The Socialist Library*, edited by J. Ramsay Macdonald, M. P.) London: Independent Labor Party, 23 Bride Lane, E. C., 1906. Pp. vi, 175.

The three works mentioned above are connected with each other, not only by a broad community of subject, but, in a less degree, by the attitude toward that subject which their authors assume. The subject is what may still claim to be the most popular and, to the average educated person of our time, the most plausible philosophy of history and politics. In calling this interpretation of past and current politics popular, I would not imply that it is necessarily and always favorable to popular or democratic ideals; as we shall see, and it is obvious without special illustration, racial theories may assume a luridly anti-popular and aristocratic character. It is popular in the sense of being prevalent in one form or another among the reading public, and especially among persons who

claim to possess average or more than average historical knowledge; it is popular also in that it appeals to sentiments which are widely diffused and sedulously fostered by the traditional school method of teaching history.

The growing mind of our youth sees in contemporary international politics, somewhat later in domestic politics as well, certain vague and ill-understood antipathies of nation to nation in the first case, of social class to class in the second. In the history of the past we discover similar antipathies finding expression in wars and revolutions. We seldom escape being infected by these antagonisms. The successes of our own nation in war come to appear to us as the preëminently worthy turning points in the world's history, and its reverses as transient incidents which only serve to render the final triumph more complete. When at last we come to reflect upon these rivalries, we very naturally connect the emotion of national pride with the pride of family and descent; and we are fain to ascribe the triumphs of our nation and social class to the primordial and secular superiority of the stock to which they belong. Our more extensive acquaintance with the imperfections and varieties of the individual members of our own society makes it difficult for us to formulate a definition of its "national character" which shall satisfy ourselves, still more difficult to win for our definition general assent. But we have seldom the like difficulty in persuading ourselves that the vices which doom our neighbors to relative extinction and impotence have been discovered, and that they are the commonplaces of every history worthy of the name. History and politics, international and even national, are likely to be summed up as a secular conflict, interrupted, but not terminated, by interbreeding of homogeneous human stocks, to which we shall apply the name of races. The typical racial philosophy aims at classifying mankind according to physical and mental characteristics, between which two sets of differences it professes to discover certain empirically established coexistences. This correlation is suggested to us most readily by certain marked differences between the physical appearance of the black, white and yellow divisions of humanity, which we find co-

existing with striking differences in degree or kind of civilization. Developing this line of thought, we may expect important sociological conclusions from a minute examination of the less obvious physical differences according to which a relatively homogeneous population such as that of western Europe may be divided. Basing ourselves on historical, archaeological, or contemporary statistical data, we may come to attach supreme importance, as indicating momentous psychical differences, to color of hair and skin, stature, length and breadth of head, and innumerable other physical characteristics. In spite of the bewildering confusion presented by the conclusions to which, by various investigators in this field, the data are said to point, the conviction that in the end some certain and valuable results will be attained is not easily overthrown.

For obvious reasons a racial theory which takes much account of physical and measurable data is more likely to convey the impression of scientific exactitude; yet there are cases in which physical differences are relegated to a very subordinate position, the stress being laid upon certain mental and moral characteristics continually revealed by various peoples throughout the course of their history, and, it is assumed, susceptible of verification even at the present day. The fantastical speculations of the Comte de Gobineau, to which M. Seillière's acute and good-humored criticisms are devoted, make little use of exact anthropological details; in so far as such details are introduced, they commonly conflict with each other and impair grievously the consistency of the argument. For Gobineau, as for most racial enthusiasts of our time, the "Aryans" are the noble race of men. "Let us first examine," writes M. Seillière, "their physical conformation."

"There is no doubt that this race was the most beautiful ever heard of.' These heroes constituted the most splendid race of men, *'whose aspect might fill heaven and earth with joy . . .'* We shall find, however, in Gobineau even here, a very characteristic peculiarity of his profoundly individual temperament. In fact, when we study more closely his writings as a whole, we find to our surprise that the Aryan does not assume with any precision in Gobineau's view the anthropological characters which contemporary scholars are agreed in assigning to him: great stature,

fair skin, rosy complexion, fair hair, blue eyes; in short, the Germanic type, which in our time would reflect these characteristics most exactly. To be sure, we notice occasionally some of these features in his descriptions; but it is with variants which would deeply offend the most recent Aryanists, educated in the school of natural science. Thus it is that the knight who is to embody Aryan nobility in the Middle Ages in Gobineau's romance, *l'Abbaye de Typhaines*, has 'black eyes well formed' and brown hair. In the *Histoire des Perses*, he will quote, as inspired by Aryan ideas, the testimony of Mussulman authors; these, however, consider blue eyes a mark of the devil, and discover them in the hated Kedas, one of the murderers of the camel of the prophet. . . . Harriett, the lovely Englishwoman of the Pleiades, has black eyes. Finally, in his best work, in which he rises to the summit of Aryanist exaltation, the ideal type of the German, Amadis, has 'long brown hair,' and so far from displaying itself in athletic limbs his strength conceals itself under a youthful and 'still somewhat frail' appearance. The explanation of these negligences or even of this preference [for dark hair] is fairly easy to find. Gobineau takes little account of the anthropological characteristics of the Aryan, simply because he did not himself possess them. Now, as he considered himself to have issued from the purest stock of this race, as he believed that he had preserved or renewed in himself all its energies, physical features were bound to assume a secondary importance, the preponderance remaining with the moral side of the ethnical contrast."¹

Racial philosophy, again, may be aristocratic and exclusive, and consequently, in view of modern redistributions of political economic power, profoundly pessimistic: a dolorous picture is given by Gobineau of the present and the future of Europe and the world. Differing from the Renaissance tradition, Gobineau had the profoundest contempt for Greek and Roman civilization, which he never wearies of denouncing as "Semitic." His German followers, who are numerous, and his less numerous French admirers and fellow-worshippers of race, refuse to follow him in sacrificing to a non-Aryan or inferior race the glories of Greece, and especially of Athens. The continued importance of Great Britain in the politics of the world, and still more the achievements, military and commercial, of the German people,² coupled with certain disquieting features in the conditions of the so-called "Latin" peoples,

¹ Seillières, pp. 45, 46.

² These countries, it should be noticed, are, according to the Aryanists, the countries in which the Aryan blood is purest and least overwhelmed by inferior stocks.

has given to German imperialism a bolder and more hopeful tone; and the dominant philosophy of this imperialism may be conveniently summed up in the word Aryanism. English imperialist philosophy is also predominantly hopeful and exultant, and its employment of racial formulæ is sufficiently strident and persistent; English racialism is, however, predominantly psychological in its tendency and does not generally deck itself out with elaborate physical measurements and anatomical generalizations. These are rather mentioned and alluded to than employed as a basis for original and far-reaching speculations.

An exception must be noted to the prevalent optimism of English racialism as well as to its reliance upon mental characteristics. The facts which are comprised in the term physical degeneration, the declining birth-rate among the wealthier classes, have forced upon sociologists the investigation of the relation between recent political and economic changes and the physical basis of national existence and progress. "Eugenic" and "telogenic" proposals for the improvement of the national stock are assured, if not of approval, at least of an expectant audience. A definitely racial tone is seldom assumed by our eugenic theorists; but their proposals have a close analogy to the proposals advanced in Germany for the preservation of the Aryan or Germanic stock. We may here quote from M. Finot:—

"Finding it impossible to identify races with our modern nationalities which are mixtures *par excellence* of the most diverse ethnical elements, the doctrine of races endeavors to divide peoples according to their component parts. No longer able to set races in opposition to one another from outside, it incites them to quarrel from within. Examining the skulls and noses within the frontiers of the same country, it tries to frighten us by revealing hostile elements wrongly amalgamated. . . . Pretexts for mutual strife have become innumerable. The Americans tell us that no way is possible of making white virtue enter into the black body of a Negro. The German maintains the necessity of exterminating, if not the Slavs, at least the Poles, whom they regard as culpable for not wishing to lose themselves in the German stock." (Introd., pp. ix, x.)

According to an influential school of racial theorists, it should be explained, the Aryan or Germanic stock is repre-

sented only by a small and diminishing fraction of the population of Europe. But the future of each nation depends on the number and the predominance of its Aryan constituents. In the "Latin" peoples the Aryans are usually supposed to be so completely overwhelmed by a heterogeneous rabble of inferior stocks that the doom of these nations is pronounced with perfect assurance; but for the "Anglo-Saxons" and the Germans there would appear to be still hope, though the struggle against degradation must be desperate and sanguinary. Again, according to the dominant school of racial anthropologists, the Aryans are to be recognized by certain physical features, some of which have already been mentioned in the quotation from M. Seillière. To them may be added "*dolichocephaly*," or relatively great length of the skull in proportion to its breadth. It is now commanded that Aryans should, in the choice of their mates, avoid above all the mixing of their blood with that of non-Aryans, but should insure that their offspring shall, like themselves, be of pure Aryan stock. If we could reckon without the obstinate vagaries of intersexual choice, this plan might, at first sight, at least, be fairly practicable. More dubious, perhaps even fatal to the Aryanist scheme, would be the adoption of certain proposals which the same theorists urge with a view to furthering Aryan predominance, and which remind us forcibly of the more moderate proposals of our own "Eugenics." They advocate, for example, the securing the position of the wealthier and more powerful classes in the community or certain sections of them by pensions, larger salaries and by other political and economic privileges. Thus German conservatism had found fervid allies in certain German Aryanists, who are doubtless inspired by the belief that the Aryan, where he is still found, cannot fail to occupy the supreme place even in our imperfect political system. The distribution of voting power according to income or ratable property, realized most deliberately in the franchise laws of certain German states—and known as "*das Dreiklassenwahl-system*"—has accordingly enjoyed the zealous advocacy of some of the Aryanists. A mischievous critic of modern theories of race examined from this point of view the voting

lists of an important German city: the highest and least numerous class of voters was found to consist exclusively of Jews! Aryanist telogenics have to thread their paths through slippery places.

To the apparent defects of the Aryan race which have brought them to their present more or less desperate condition, including their persistent propensity to "mixed" unions or *mésalliances*, joins itself the question how will the other races behave in the face of these efforts at their subjection. Again the past seems to suggest that they will not find themselves wholly without resources.

"Inasmuch as the fair-haired people with narrow skulls, that is, the dolichocephalic, only number about fifty millions out of the four hundred millions who at present occupy Europe, how will they succeed in becoming masters? What is to be done with those particular brachycephalic and brown-haired dolichocephalic who are determined not to disappear? What is to be done with their progeny?"

In their burning desire to save the future of humanity, the priests of the new cult go so far as absolutely to forbid the majority of men and women from having children. The most lenient among them are content to allow abortion and infanticide, if not to impose it. Here their courage fails them. Where, however, French anthropologists fear to tread, those of Germany step forward with frenzied zeal. *Savants* like Ammon advise that the same methods which European civilizers use in the case of negroes and savage tribes should be used in the case of those whom they consider 'degraded' in the matter of race. Let them be soaked with spirits supplied gratis, let them be attracted to places where debauchery is rampant, let them even be led to contract all kinds of diseases, and so, exhausted, depraved and enfeebled, they will finally disappear from the earth."³

It is possible to imagine a society in which the stronger classes might to some extent guide the destinies of the weaker along the ways here suggested. We might, indeed, doubt whether any class of men possesses that degree of conscious racial "virtue" which would preserve them during the exercise of such a regimen from moral ruin and even from physical extinction. In all societies the ruling class can, to a greater or less extent, control the moral destinies of the classes subject to it. But ages of dream-existence would surely be needful before

³ Finot, p. 21.

the fair-haired, long-headed population, say of Great Britain, would be brought to adopt such a policy toward its kinsmen of diverse pigment and stature.

Of the data on which these prognostications of anthropological hostilities are based I shall speak later. Meanwhile, it should be noticed that a distinguished French anthropologist anticipates an early outbreak of the racial conflict in which the destiny of humanity shall be decided. M. Vacher de Lapouge predicted in an often quoted passage, written twenty years ago, a fully race-conscious war between the dolichocephalic and the brachycephalic inhabitants of Europe. "I am convinced that in the next [the twentieth] century, millions will cut each other's throats because of one or two degrees more or less of cephalic index. This is the sign, which is replacing the biblical shibboleth and linguistic affinities, by which people will recognize one another as belonging to the same nationalities, and by which the most sentimental will assist at the wholesale slaughter of peoples."⁴

A more sanguine and genial tone, as already noticed, pervades the historical and political speculations of England, tinged though they often are by pride of race and stock. Anti-semitism, which is a perennial source of inspiration to the racial theorists of the continent, excites among ourselves comparatively little interest; nor are we confronted like the white inhabitants of some British colonies and of the United States with the immediate exigencies of a "color" question. The Irish people have indeed endured their share of condemnation for their "Celtic" faults of race, but the anti-Irish argument, as pursued on the basis of race, is advocated in a dilettantist temper, no great pretence being made to scientific exactitude. The relatively low esteem which intellectual speculations enjoy in our country has many evil results, but it brings some compensation in the comparative absence among us of the extravagant fanaticisms of continental *savants*. To the practical problem of dealing with less civilized or diversely civilized peoples, our countrymen have devoted a full share of their interests and

⁴ Finot, p. 16.

energies. But pure theories of race flourish chiefly in the land of professorial patriotism, the German Empire, France and Italy contributing a more modest share.

M. Finot's book is the widest in its scope of the three works before us, the author addressing himself to every aspect of the racial theories which he assails. The first part is devoted to the physical differences between human beings on which Continental racialism is now disposed to found its theories. The second part confronts these differences with modern theories of variation and modifications of plants, animals and men by their environment. The third part discusses the alleged ineradicable psychical and moral differences between peoples, on which, as we have noticed, Gobineau was more disposed to rely. Part IV is historical, seeking to demonstrate, from archæology and history, "the mysterious or uncertain origins of peoples and races." Part V treats mainly of the negro problem under the heading, "Are There Peoples Condemned to Remain Eternally Inferior to Others?" The first two parts appear to me the most successful. The third part is the least successful, as might be expected from the less tangible and verifiable nature of its subject-matter. One who sympathizes with the intentions and the opinions of the author is all the more pained by puerilities like the following: "The English people were noted in the first third of the nineteenth century for their immorality; to-day they are entirely devoted to moral improvement, temperance societies and piety" (p. 212). I hasten to add that I consider some of the author's strictures on British self-complacency well deserved, whatever may be thought of the right of other nations to cast the first stone.

The bewildering variety of the divisions of mankind according to physical characteristics forms the subject of the first and most successful part of M. Finot's argument. He adverts to the difficulty of obtaining exact measurements of the physical features in question, and to the discrepancies between the methods of various observers, which he contends render the results of no value. M. Finot gives abundant illustrations of the contradictions and absurdities to which these in-

vestigations lead. Pages 53-56 give some account of the diverse historic subdivisions of the human species, and of the more minute subdivisions which the refinements of modern racial speculation have suggested. His introductory considerations might well cause hesitation to those who are disposed to adopt facile and superficial divisions, and to found far-reaching sociological conclusions upon them.

"Now the number of the elements which enter into the classification of human beings is very considerable. The anthropologists of the ship *Novare* (see the works of Weisbach), adopted forty-two methods of measurement, whilst anthropological instructions generally demand from observers from twenty to forty necessary data. Broca takes note of thirty-four of the first order, Topinard eighteen necessary and fifteen optional ones, whereas Quetelet points out forty-two in his *Anthropométrie*. And when it is considered that though essential they are not identical in all authors, the . . . facility with which human races may be created at will can be easily imagined! Far from being astonished at the number already extant, we must bless heaven for having preserved us from a thousand million races and consequent classifications" (p. 54).

The confusion is illustrated as follows:—

"Subsequently the classifications, being multiplied and ramified to suit the convenience of *savants* and their more or less exact notions of human conformation and qualities, varied from the three races of Cuvier, the four of Leibnitz and Kant, and the nine centers of Agassiz, and at length reached a hundred. Even one hundred and twenty have been proclaimed in certain archæological congresses. Isidore Geoffrey Saint-Hilaire divides human beings into *orthognathic* (oval face with vertical jaws), *eurygnathic* (high cheek bones, Mongolian type), *prognathic* (projecting jaws, Ethiopian type), *eurygnathic and prognathic* (cheek bones far apart, projecting jaws, Hottentot type).

"Gratiolet distinguished *frontal*, *parietal* and *occipital* races, characterized by the prominence of the front, middle and back parts of the skull and brain.

"According to Huxley, men are divided into two capital sections, the *ulotrichi*, with woolly hair, and the *leiotrichi*, with smooth hair."

M. Finot is able to point out, not only discrepancies between the methods of different observers in respect of the same physical characteristic, but between the estimates formed by various recent and contemporary racialists of the importance of particular marks. Thus dolichocephaly and brachycephaly, which, according to M. Vacher de Lapouge, will be the watch-words of the Armageddon of the twentieth century, are, ac-

cording to Broca, Manouvrier and others, among the least important differences between human beings.

"Manouvrier dwells on the difficulty of connecting the numerous variations of the skull with the variations of intelligence or character." According to him, "it is absolutely erroneous to make of the variations of the cephalic index⁵ a sort of phrenology of races, for no biological fact justifies it." "On the contrary," he tells us, "the variations of the cephalic index are the most insignificant physiologically. In the brachycephalic, the skull gains in breadth what it loses in length."

The curious collocation of the various peoples of the earth which results from classifying them according to the cephalic index supplies one of the happiest of M. Finot's arguments. They will be found on pages 62-64. A passage may be quoted on the distribution of dolichocephaly or the low "cephalic index":

"The dolichocephalic index (under 76) is to be found in particular among the Hottentots, the Krous Negroes, the Muchikongo and Bakongo (73), and the Ashanti in Africa; the Papuans of New Guinea (74), diverse Australians, the islanders of the New Hebrides and the Tasmanians in Oceanica; also among Hindu tribes (Kota, Badagas, Todas of Nilghiri), the Ainos of Saghalien, the Pathans of the Punjaub, etc., in Asia; the Eskimos, Hurons and Botocudos in America; whereas in Europe it is especially the Corsicans and Portuguese who appear to embody the ideal of M. Gobineau and M. Lapouge" (p. 63).

Similar results follow from the proposed divisions of human beings according to other physical characteristics. That physical features are modified by exercise, as, for example, that the head is enlarged by exercise, is what we might expect, and this is the result of observations made by many inquirers, notably Parchappe and Broca (pp. 66-67). In some cases physical features are the results of deliberate modifications of the infant body. Again differences of soil, climate and diet are found to modify animals and plants, and men, even, within narrow

⁵ The cephalic index represents the ratio of the breadth of the skull to its length. Thus the dolichocephalic have a low, the brachycephalic, a high cephalic index.

geographical limits. Of this many striking instances are given in Part II, "Towards the Unity of the Human Type." One instance may be quoted:—

"Delpon tells us that in the ward of Figeac (department of Lot), whereas the inhabitants of the calcareous and fertile plateau of the Canton of Livernon are strong and vigorous, and have a mean height of 1.632 metres, those of the mountainous Canton of Latrouguière, with a granite and sterile soil, producing only rye, buckwheat, potatoes and chestnuts, are remarkable for their narrow shoulders, tight chests and lymphatic temperament, and attain their maximum height only at twenty-two or twenty-three, which height is on an average about 1.599 metres, decreasing to 1.579 metres in the Commune of Montet. Lagneau has shown that in granitic countries which lack phosphates, animals, plants and men do not attain their normal height" (p. 133).

A better known and very striking instance of the speedy modification of physical traits by the *milieu* is supplied by North America, where a characteristic physical type has been produced in a few centuries, a type, moreover, which corresponds in many startling details with the earlier North American or Red Indian. The diversity of the "races" which have contributed to the North American population, both from each other and from the type to which they tend to be assimilated, is well known and needs no elaborate archæological or historical proof.

Another masterly argument of M. Finot's for the fundamental unity of the human type is derived from the investigations into the variations of plants and animals, which variations, according to received biological doctrines, result, in favorable circumstances, in new species, hardly to be recognized as cognate with the common original. Such new species are further separated from each other by the sterility of their unions. No such separation can be observed between the several "races" of human beings. The unions of diverse human types are often fruitful in the highest degree; and M. Finot traces the happiest results from the "crossing" of races in the past, and expects no less happy results in the future. These considerations seem fatal to the theory, and fatal, in the long run, to the practice of racial antagonism (see pp. 151-167).

So much inferior are the third and fourth parts to the earlier divisions that one is moved to regret that the first parts were not made the subject of an independent work. The great difference between the competence which the author displays in handling the anatomical, the psychological, or historical aspects of the problem, leaves me little hesitation in concluding that M. Finot's professional education has been medical, his excursions into history and politics being those of an ardent but neither learned nor critical amateur. The conjecture as to M. Finot's profession is confirmed by the repeated references, which will be painful to some of his readers, to vivisectional experiments and to serotherapy. In psychological insight and critical power, the book compares unfavorably with the two other works before us; and more particularly in respect to historical criticisms, the book is immeasurably inferior to the sociological writings of an English assailant of racial theories, Mr. J. M. Robertson. The illustrations which are given of the modifications under diverse influences of the minds of peoples are indeed valuable, and sometimes very convincing, but they seldom give the impression of real originality and weight. From the point of view of the influence of the book on British thought, at all events, the inferiority of this part of the work is much to be regretted; for among us, facile psychological generalizations from fragments of poems, from ill-understood historical data, is a much more fertile source of racial prejudice than are recondite "craniological" observations. One very serious criticism can be made on many of the arguments of Part IV on "The Mysterious or Uncertain Origin of Peoples and Races," and that is that M. Finot does not appear to possess any adequate method of evaluating anthropological data. He shows himself willing to accept such ethnical speculations as suit his own purposes without inquiring whether such inferences from the dimensions of skulls found in caverns, etc., possess much or little value. The following passage will show how easily M. Finot lapses into loose and facile ethnological declamation when his own argument has fairly started on its triumphant course:—

"At the time of Julius Cæsar . . . France counted among its inhabitants three peoples differing in manners, tongue, and even in race.*. . . According to the anthropologists, the Aquitani belonged to a race with black hair, whose type is now preserved among the modern Basques. The Gauls were divided into two distinct groups, the Galli and the Cymri. The latter came from the Black Sea and constituted what we are agreed to call the Belgians. Whereas these last had light eyes and fair hair, so Thierry tells us, the Galli had brown or black hair and eyes. Following Thierry, the historians have recounted real romances† on the respective life of the Aquitani, the Cymri, and the Galli, and we are told that *already* at that period they were mixed by way of marriage and were undergoing reciprocal influences.

"We must not forget the existence of the autochthonous race, the Ligurians, of whom we have already found numerous and imperishable traces. All these ethnographical elements have to be combined, and even supposing that there were no other forgotten elements, they furnish us with a singular opinion of the 'Gaulist' doctrine, which reduces Gaul to France and identifies the French with the Gauls" (pp. 239, 240).

It is surely a grave error to understand the observations of ancient writers on the populations of Gaul and Britain, for example, as first-rate "anthropological" investigations. Rather they are to be classed with the observations which an intelligent foreigner might at the present day make in a strange country on the physical characteristics of the inhabitants. A visitor from southern Europe would probably still be impressed with the tall stature and the fair, ruddy complexion of the inhabitants of the British Isles. European travelers in America and observers of American tourists in Europe have already satisfied themselves of the existence of an American "type." Closer scrutiny would indeed reveal innumerable deviations from this type, and might well show that the type did not even represent a predominance of the characteristics implied in it. In accordance with well-known psychological laws, the features which contrast most strongly with those familiar to us are most likely to attract our attention. Is it not most reasonable to suppose that the inhabitants of a particular region in the time of Julius Cæsar would contain instances of as many diversities of type as they offer at the present day?

* *The Aquitani, the Belgæ and the Galli.* See Cæsar, "De Bello Gallico, I, i.

† An unintelligible expression.

And if it were possible to establish some considerable difference in the distribution, say, of the dark and the fair, might not this be best explained by modifications in modes of living, in climate, in diet, rather than by the migrations of unsuspected "Aryan" or "Semitic" intruders?

M. Seillière is at great pains to establish the close connection between imperialist philosophies—and especially of racial philosophies—and the political conditions and ambitions of the peoples among which they arise. He shows in particular how the Germanist theories of the origins of French civilization, having served the purpose of supporting the pretensions of the French nobility against monarch and people, became in the eighteenth century the historical basis of the leveling and humanitarian aspirations of the prerevolutionary thinkers. Count Gobineau, on the other hand, returns, in respect to French history, to the standpoint of Boulainvilliers: the Germanic invaders become once more a haughty aristocracy; and the course of French history through absolute monarchy to democratic revolution is the story of the supersession of the born rulers of mankind by the black and the yellow "canaille." Gobineau's Aryanism is in fact but the extension to the whole of recorded and conjectured history of the count's Germanic, that is aristocratic, prejudices. It is instructive to contrast this view with the Germanism which is most prevalent in English popular historiography, in which the Germanic freeman appears not as the lord of an inferior servile stock, but as a tiller of the soil who is at the same time the peer of kings.

Gobineau divided humanity into three races, the black, the yellow, and the white or Aryan. He is very far indeed from claiming for the white race the possession of all the excellences which have contributed to what is generally understood as civilization. Artistic inspiration is characteristic not of the Aryans, but of the black race; the industrial and commercial virtues are to all intents the monopoly of the yellow race. Indeed, it is the vagueness of the Aryan virtues which must first strike the attention of the student of the Count's numerous works. Gradually out of a medley of fantastic incon-

sistencies emerges the perception that the ineffably noble Aryan is only the reflection of the Count's own extravagant political prejudices. Moderation in political strife is naturally recognized by all as a valuable virtue and it is, perhaps with some justice, claimed as especially characteristic of the peoples of the temperate zone. It is therefore not unnaturally attributed to the fair-skinned race as such, and so to the Aryans of popular history and Gobineau's speculations. But Gobineau does not understand by its openness of mind, the habit of looking at both sides of a question, the disposition to accept a practicable compromise. On the contrary, the moderation of his Aryans consists in avoiding humanitarian sentiments toward the inferior races by nature their slaves on the one hand, and submission to the blind cult of monarchy and absolute power on the other. Not only so, but the true Aryan recognizes in his heart no gods but himself and his fellow Aryans. For all this, the history of his imagined Aryans is a history of treachery to their ideals and eventually of decline to the danger of extinction.

The preceding remarks may derive additional interest from the mutual admiration of Richard Wagner and Count Gobineau. Their relations with each other and the strange incongruity of their fundamental tendencies are described by M. Seillière with infinite humor and delicacy. Wagner, a passionate lover of humanity and of the animal species, looked to the German peoples for the redemption of the human race from every kind of cruelty and wrong. In his eyes, the German people is preëminently the Christian people, whose mission it is to realize on the world's stage the Saviour's ideals of love and brotherhood. Such aspirations are wholly foreign to the theories of Count Gobineau. To him, the Christian religion has been in all its stages the religion of a degraded civilization; its principles have nothing in common with the aristocratic exclusiveness of the Aryans. Gobineau's Golden Age lay exclusively in the past; Wagner's had indeed existed in the past, but was to reappear, amplified and glorified, in the future. In spite of this, the friendship of the two men results in the close association in Germany of the disciples of

Wagner and Gobineau; the agreement between the respective views of the two masters, however, hardly extends beyond certain forms of expression and a "profound" anti-Semitism.

As might be expected, Sir Sydney Ollivier's contribution to "The Socialist Library" is replete with the learning which is so much superior to mere book-learning—the learning, namely, that comes from the practical experience of the humane official and administrator who, without class or national prejudices, insists on becoming acquainted with the facts at first hand. He gives a vivid picture of the diverse human materials of which our imperial civilization is composed, and traces to their selfish and narrow source the convenient generalizations of the capitalist class which thrives upon the subjection of the colored members of the human family. He is naturally more successful in demonstrating the crudity and barrenness, in the scientific sense, of "the short view" of the European capitalist, which sees in the colored peoples only more or less tractable tools, than in resolving all the moral problems which are raised by the relations of white and black; but he is able to point with legitimate pride to the practical solution of many of these problems in the British West Indian colonies.

His more general treatment of the problem of race is truly philosophical and broad. He is fain to retain the name race, understanding by it a specific human type, the product mainly of local conditions. "The ancient race-theory—the myth of actual race-parentage—is practically the true account of the greater part of the matter. Whatever may be the cause or creative force of humanity, the cause and molding force of race appears as local environment." The political thinker and the statesman must take account of the fundamental aspiration of all men toward brotherhood and equality and of the certain refusal of the diverse human types or races to be merely merged or absorbed in a neutral mass. "The principles by virtue of which the white European has obtained a leadership which even Islam cannot contest with him are principles which deny race distinctions. There is his strength. If he goes back from them, he becomes himself a barbarian, and, though he

may exterminate the black, he cannot lead or live with him" (p. 174).

The conclusion seems justified that the true philosophy of our relations to other "races" is nothing fundamentally diverse from a democratic philosophy of the relations of individual members of the same society to each other: this is the recognition of fundamental unity and equality amid a diversity of gift and aspiration which lends to the unity completeness and character. To this should be added faith in the future and its illimitable possibilities of good. To decline upon measurements of the merely physical and subhuman is not only to sacrifice to self-interest our humane aspirations, but to hide away the key of knowledge.

W. J. ROBERTS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF, WALES.

IS AMERICA MORALLY DECADENT?

In every period of human history, when great social and political changes have occurred, the irreconcilable pessimist has wailed loudly and long. This wail is a natural phenomenon; it follows certain happenings as night follows day. Conditions are now ripe for pessimism; and the pessimist is abroad in the land. To-day is not the time for blind optimism; but are the American people becoming morally weak? Evils grave and dangerous confront us; but is it a fact that the first decade of the twentieth century is a uniquely degenerate period when viewed from the standpoint of morality? Are the heart and conscience of the American people corrupted? Is our civic life more rotten and degenerate than it was in earlier periods of American history? Is the golden age of American history in the past? Are the writers and lecturers accurate when they tell us that civic virtue is dead, that bribery and corruption run riot as never before, that wealth has corrupted young and old, that the young of to-day are less upright and righteous than those who lived a few decades ago?